

**REMARKS**

**Remarks regarding the Specification**

The Examiner objects to the disclosure on the ground of the following informality of misspelling: "foudn" on page 14, line 14 should have been "found". Applicant submits the amendment to the specification to correct the informality regarding misspelling and to correct an additional misspelling contained within the same paragraph.

An earnest attempt has been made hereby to respond to the informality objection contained in the June 16, 2004 Official Action. Withdrawal of the objection is hereby solicited. If the Examiner feels that a telephonic interview will rectify any misunderstandings with this matter, she is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned.

**Remarks regarding the Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, and 10 are allowed. Claims 23-30, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for not enabling or providing a written description regarding the modification of *any* or all amyloid-forming protein. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for containing new matter not sufficiently described in the specification at time of filing.

Claims 15-16, 23-24, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boland *et al.* Further, claims 23, 25, 29-30, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boland *et al* in view of Peterson *et al*, Davis, *et al*, Gardner *et al*, Schubert *et al*, or Ohashi *et al*.

In response to the Examiner's rejections, claims 15, 16, 23-30, and 32 are canceled.

Claims 31 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

In re STEVENS, et al. S.N. 09/712,819  
Response to Office Action of June 16, 2004  
Page -8-

Claims 31 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants submit amended claims 31 and 33 which have been recast in independent form to overcome the Examiner's objections.

In response to Examiner's rejections of claim 34, Applicant amends claim 34 to be dependent upon redrafted claim 33. Claim 33 specifically refers to human kappa-IV immunoglobulin light chain and also identifies the peptides used to inhibit fibril formation. The amendments to claim 33 represent the embodiment the Examiner considers enabled and described, and thus render moot the Examiner's rejections of claim 34 on the grounds of non-enablement and written description (35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph).

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicant submits that claim 34 is now allowable as a dependent on redrafted claim 33.

New claim 35 is a verbatim recitation of rejected claim 28 with the exceptions that the claim depends on redrafted claim 31 and the term "inhibitor" has been amended to "biological molecules".

An earnest attempt has been made hereby to respond to the Official Action dated June 16, 2004. All claims are deemed in condition for allowance. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview will expedite allowance, she is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned. Previously submitted claims 1, 2, 5, 7, and 10 have been allowed. Applicant requests allowance of redrafted claims 31 and 33, and depending claims 34-35 therefrom.

Respectfully submitted,

**CHERSKOV & FLAYNIK**

By

  
Michael J. Cherskov (Reg. 33,664)